



George D. Foscardo, AICP
Community Development Director

CITY OF SAN BRUNO
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

**CITY OF SAN BRUNO
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
567 EL CAMINO REAL
November 7, 2000**



CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Specific Plan Study Session was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by **Chair Birt**.

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Marshall
Commissioner Sammut
Commissioner Schindler
Commissioner Petersen
Commissioner Tobin
Vice-Chair Johnson
Chair Birt

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Division: **George Foscardo**, Com. Dev. Director
Steve Padovan, Associate Planner
Grant Wilson, Associate Planner
Tanya Sullins, Recording Secretary
City Attorney: **Jonathan Lowell**

Associate Planner Padovan entered a brief staff report. A digital photo and overhead presentation was provided.

The new owners, **The Martin Group/Regis Homes**, were introduced. **Mr. David Cropper** with **The Martin Group** gave a brief history of the company. **Robert Wagner** with **Regis Homes** was introduced, and also gave a brief company history. He explained that this partnership was put together because they want to have the expertise of both aspects (commercial and residential) working together on this project.

Commissioner Sammut was concerned about the height requirement with the hotel. If the vote does not come through, what would the contingency plan be. **Mr. Cropper** stated that there is no doubt that there will be a hotel there; the issue will be the size and number of rooms. They

want the best quality hotel. **Commissioner Sammut** was concerned that if voter approval was not granted for a taller building, a quality hotel will not be interested in the site.

NAVY SITE PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Jack Borland, 402 Boardwalk, president of the **Peninsula Place Homeowners Association**, requested the condominiums be removed from the Specific Plan Area. **Ralph Sullivan**, also an owner at **Peninsula Place**, reiterated that the condominiums should be removed from the specific plan because he doesn't believe the existing privately owned condos should be required to conform to the development standards in the specific plan. He also didn't want pedestrian walkways entering into **Peninsula Place** because it is private property. He further questioned why other properties were left out, but **Peninsula Place** was included.

Commissioner Petersen wanted to let the public know that they are invited to submit written comments to the **Community Development Department** until December 11th at 5:00 p.m. **Jack Borland** approached the stand again and stated that he would support a first class hotel. **Community Development Director Foscardo** stated that staff has been working on getting a flagship full service hotel. He also commended **Associate Planner Padovan** on his work with the specific plan. Regarding **Peninsula Place**, the complex can be removed from the Plan Area without difficulty as no development is proposed, and the plan can remain intact. The city can still do pedestrian linkages with sidewalks along **Commodore Avenue**. The idea was to provide convenient pedestrian access so that anyone living in **Peninsula Place** or coming from other properties can walk right to **El Camino**, to **Tanforan Park Shopping Center**, and to the **BART** station. We want to encourage neighbors to come into and out of the area on foot. **Vice Chair Johnson** asked how the decision was made to include a portion of **Peninsula Place**. **George Foscardo** stated that originally, staff had included the entire block from Cherry Avenue to El Camino. The idea was to encompass all the properties that would be effected by a new large development especially with regard to pedestrian and transit linkages. If **Tanforan** had been farther along in their plans, they would have included that property also. As for the properties that were removed from the original Plan Area, the **Airport Trade Center** can be redeveloped on its own. It is between residential and commercial and across from a cemetery, and could be developed either way. In a specific plan the exact uses need to be identified and the City was undecided how that property would be developed so in order to move forward with a plan, it was left out. The **Latter Day Saints** properties were removed as requested by the church but their property will be developed with sidewalks so people can walk into that community space. It was assumed that **Peninsula Place** would remain as is and is shown on the plan as residential. Staff wanted to show the linkages to **Peninsula Place** and how those linkages relate to the new development on the Navy property. We were looking at it as part of this bigger community. Staff understands the residents concerns and will remove the condos from the Plan Area. **Associate Planner Padovan** reminded everyone that the public comment period on the draft specific plan is until December 11th. There will be another meeting on November 21, dealing entirely with the Specific Plan, and the next one will be on December 5th. At that point the Commission will recommend to the **City Council** on some type of draft plan. On December 12 the **City Council** will review public comments, and any changes to plan. We are also proposing to get this up on the web. If anyone wants to purchase one it is \$45 for the EIR and \$15 for the plan. **Chair Birt** wanted to know if questions could be submitted via e-mail. **Associate Planner Padovan** confirmed that it can be done from the website, or to him directly. **Community Development Director Foscardo** added that there were quite a few comments at the **Citizens Advisory Committee**, and the reason for having this on the next few **Planning**

Commission meetings is to allow the new property owners to see how they can fit their plans into our specific plan. It will allow them to suggest changes, ask questions, and to understand community concerns. **Vice-Chair Johnson** wanted to clarify why **Peninsula Place** did not want to be included in the specific plan. **Community Development Director Foscardo** stated that after several conversations with different individuals from **Peninsula Place**, they are under the impression that once a boundary has been drawn around an area, even though it is only a planning area, some people think it is a project area where work is being done. They would rather be outside the area to eliminate any concerns. For instance, **Mr. Sullivan**, an engineer for **BART**, stated that in his profession, if a line is drawn around a site, it indicates the area where work is being done. The City's Specific Plan is a planning area, as opposed to a construction area. **Mr. Borland** approached the podium and stated that they are also concerned about future construction. He stated that when this site-specific plan was shown to their attorney he was alarmed. **Commissioner Tobin** asked if **Peninsula Place** would remain in the redevelopment area. **Attorney Lowell** stated that **Peninsula Place** is not in the redevelopment area. **Mr. Sullivan's** concern is that in his profession a "Site Specific Plan" means only the work area that is involved in a construction area. **Community Development Director Foscardo** stated that a Specific Plan under state law is something entirely different from a Site Specific Plan in engineering terms. **Kathy O'Leary, 415 Piccadilly Place**, is concerned because **Peninsula Place** is private property, and why the property is outlined. Everything else outlined is part of a purchase. She is also concerned about what may happen in the future. Staff reiterated that the condominiums will be removed from the Plan Area.

NAVY SITE PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 6:53 P.M.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENCED AT 7:00 p.m.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - MEETING OF September 19, 2000**
Motion Petersen / Second Schindler to approve the minutes without changes.
2. **COMMUNICATIONS**
None
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
None
4. **546 First Avenue (Tape file – 408B)**
Request for a Use Permit to construct a 926 square foot, second story addition to an existing single family dwelling with a one car garage that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area, a floor area ratio of .63 where .55 is allowed and a second story that is not set back 5 feet further than the front setback of the first story; per Sections 12.200.030.B.1 and 5, 12.200.040.B.2 and 12.200.050.B of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - **Balram Kumar**, applicant and owner; UP-00-29.

Associate Planner Padovan entered staff report dated November 7, 2000, into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Commissioner Marshall asked about the parking space provided. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that there are 14 feet from the garage to the sidewalk. **Commissioner Petersen** was questioning the requirement of drainage to the street. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that if the property is sloping it is a requirement, but on a flat property, it is difficult to drain without a sump pump. It is not required on a flat property to have a sump pump. **Commissioner Schindler** stated that gutters around the perimeter of the roof would take care of any water drainage problems. **Commissioner Marshall** was questioning the size of the addition, and wanted to keep the five-foot setback. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that this design is similar to the architectural style of the homes immediately surrounding the subject property and the design was approved at the **Architectural Review Committee** meeting. Furthermore, the design is complimentary, other homes in the neighborhood have no five-foot front setbacks, and the recessed front entry with a balcony above provides enough interest to the front façade. As for the square footage, it is only 1630 square feet, and the City has allowed 2100 square feet of living area with a one-car garage. Also, there is adequate on-street parking. **Commissioner Schindler** commented that with the lot being only 75 feet deep, to add a larger garage would significantly increase the floor area ratio.

Mr. and Mrs. Kumar, the applicant and owner, were present to answer any questions.

Chair Birt asked about the size of the rooms, and wanted to make sure they understood all of the conditions. **Vice-Chair Johnson** was asking about the room in the garage that is currently being used as habitable space. She wanted to be sure that the room would be converted back to a one-car garage. **Associate Planner Padovan** suggested that a condition be added to remove the structure in the garage so that there is no living area in the garage. **Commissioner Petersen** asked if they will be re-roofing the garage, and asked if they object to a condition to put gutters on the roof to redirect the water. Owner stated that the water never goes to the street, but to the back.

Public Hearing Opened

Lynn Ward at 555 First Avenue, was disappointed that the planner didn't talk about the north, south and east exposure of this property. She also thanked the **Planning Commissioner** who was concerned with the drainage problem in their area. After a heavy rain the water is more than 4 inches. Most residents have sump pumps to alleviate the problems. She has gutters with downspouts that work very well. She commented that the occupants are very good neighbors and hope that they stay for a long time. The design shows a hip roof and she is concerned that it will overshadow her backyard. Wanted to know the height, and if the upper story windows on the backside, can be on the side, so they don't overlook her backyard. She was also concerned who will supervise the contractor.

Public Hearing Closed

Chair Birt asked about **Lynn's** concerns in regards to the contractor. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated if there are any property damages it would be between the two property owners. Regarding the light impact, it wasn't considered because there is adequate space between the two yards, and the building will only be 22 feet high, so the reduction of light should not be too significant. Regarding the windows on the side of the rooms, they can be moved to the side, but they wanted it on the rear because they wanted to look down onto their property instead of the house next door. **Commissioner Schindler** stated that the rear of the house is

19 feet from the property line. The house is being built to the front of the lot; if they hadn't gone up they would have to go toward the backyard.

Motion Schindler / Second Tobin to approve Use Permit 00-29 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-8) and Conditions of Approval (1-13) – *adding item #13 and #14 to add gutters to the perimeter of the room, and removing the habitable space in the garage.*

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, October 28, 2000 and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on October 27, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The request for a Use Permit to construct a 926 square foot, second story addition to an existing single family dwelling with a one car garage that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area, a floor area ratio of .63 where .55 is allowed and a second story that is not set back 5 feet further than the front setback of the first story at 546 First Avenue will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use because the addition will blend well with the existing home as well as those surrounding, there is adequate parking provided and the use is consistent with surrounding residential uses.
6. The new addition will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the proposal is consistent with the size and scale of the surrounding neighborhood and the design, architecture, and materials will match the existing structure.
7. The proposal for an expanded single-family home is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.
8. The proposed dwelling is in conformance with the San Bruno Redevelopment Project Area Plan, dated July 1999.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the

Summary is filed, Use Permit 00-29 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 00-29 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.

2. The request for a Use Permit to construct a 926 square foot, second story addition to an existing single family dwelling with a one car garage that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area, a floor area ratio of .63 where .55 is allowed and a second story that is not set back 5 feet further than the front setback of the first story at 546 First Avenue shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 7, 2000 labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit.
6. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for revocation of this permit.
8. Prior to final inspection, the windows, trim, roof material, and exterior finish and color on the addition and existing structure shall match.
9. The entire structure shall be repainted.
10. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
11. Install a new sanitary sewer clean out at the property line per City requirements.
12. An encroachment permit shall be required for any work in the public right-of-way and no storage of building materials shall be permitted in the public right-of-way.
13. The existing enclosed room in the garage shall be removed and the garage returned to its original layout.
14. All drainage from the roof shall be collected into gutters and the down spouts shall be directed toward the street.

(Chairperson Birt advised of the seven-day appeal period).

5. 625 Sixth Avenue (Tape file – 408B)

Request for a use permit to allow construction of a new addition that would result in a gross floor area increase of over 50%; per Section 12.200.030.B.1 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - Sia Consulting Engineers, designer; **Jagdish Kumar**, owner; UP 00-30.

Associate Planner Wilson entered staff report dated November 7, 2000, into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Contractor for project was present to answer any questions.

Public Hearing opened.

Rudy Alva from 645 Sixth Avenue commented that the neighbourhood is currently running low on parking space, due to businesses being run out of the home, and was concerned if there is additional residence what this will do to the parking problem. **Chair Birt** asked what staff would do regarding the parking issue. **Associate Planner Wilson** stated that he will direct the Neighbourhood Improvement Representative to look into that. In this particular application it shouldn't have a significant bearing on the parking issue due to the square foot ratio.

Commissioner Sammut asked about the rear addition if the roof would have the same slope as the existing home. **Associate Planner Wilson** stated that addition would have a different type of roof, since a building permit for the type of roof on the existing part of the home cannot be given. **Commissioner Tobin** wanted to know if the existing roof had been finalized.

Associate Planner Wilson confirmed that it had.

Motion Sammut / Second Marshall to approve UP-00-30 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-8) and Conditions of Approval (1-15).

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, October 28, 2000, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on October 27, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The use permit request to construct a 639 square foot addition to the single-family home at 625 Sixth Avenue will not be injurious or detrimental to the property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the addition complies with all setback, height, floor area, and lot coverage requirements of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance.

6. The general appearance of the residential addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the architectural design and materials will match the existing structure as closely as possible.
7. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
8. The construction of the addition to the existing residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, UP-00-30 shall not be valid for any purpose. UP-00-30 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The proposed addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 7, 2000 labeled Exhibit "A," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. Install new sanitary sewer clean-out at property line per City standard.
6. The residence, garage, and addition shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. Address numbers must be at least four inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
8. Sliding doors and windows which are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony) must have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.
9. Exterior entry doors (including pedestrian garage entry door) on the house are to be metal or 1-3/4" solid core wood with a deadbolt lock with a bolt throw of at least one inch. The front door must have a 190-degree peep viewer unless there are vision panels in or around the door.

10. Any windows in or adjacent to the front door and within reach (40") of the door-locking device are to have burglary resistant glazing or be equivalently resistant.
11. If any French doors are installed, the inactive leaf must have floor and ceiling extension bolts of at least 3/4" throw.
12. The addition shall use exterior building materials, which are compatible with the existing residence as indicated on the plans.
13. The designer shall ensure that the existing water service is sufficient for the new addition. Submit hydraulic calculation to the City of San Bruno Public Works Department for review if upsizing is necessary.
14. The homeowner shall ensure that the existing sewer service is adequate to handle the additional bathrooms as planned.
15. The garage shall be used for the storage of vehicles. No part of the garage shall be used as living space.

Commissioner Petersen stated that regarding business parking their vehicles in the local city streets, it could be reported to Neighborhood Improvement Representatives.

(**Chairperson Birt** advised of the seven-day appeal period).

6. 105 Cypress Avenue (Tape file – 408B)

Request for a conditional use permit to construct a 946 square foot addition to the rear of an existing single-family dwelling resulting in a living area of 2327 square feet with a single-car garage where 1825 is allowed; an addition of greater than 50% gross floor area; a floor area ratio of .69 where .55 is allowed; and a minor modification permit to allow continuation of a substandard side yard setback; per Sections 12.120.010.B, 12.200.030.B.1,2, 12.200.050.B and 12.200.080.A.1 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - **Victoria and Garo DerTerrosian**, owners; **Bob George**, architect/applicant; UP 00-31, MM-00-07.

Associate Planner Wilson entered staff report dated November 7, 2000, into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Architect Robert George was present to answer any questions.

Chair Birt asked **Mr. George** to elaborate on what was done on the plans to correct the parking issue. He said that he took the garage door, and recessed it farther into the garage, to fit a car in the driveway, and the garage. **Commissioner Marshall** asked **Mr. George** to show on the slide where the square footage was reduced. **Commissioner Tobin** asked about the skylights if they were dome shaped. **Mr. George** confirmed that they would be a dome shape. He also asked about the pear pit on top of the roof, the height of the rail and the access to the skylight. **Commissioner Tobin** also wanted to know where the heating unit would be. **Mr. George** said that it would be in the attic, and the existing one would be removed.

Public Hearing opened.

Public Hearing closed.

Motion Vice-Chair Johnson / Second Petersen to approve UP-00-31 and MM-00-07 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-9) and Conditions of Approval (1-16).

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, October 28, 2000, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on October 27, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The use permit request to construct a 946 square foot addition to the single-family home at 105 Cypress Avenue will not be injurious or detrimental to the property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the addition complies with height and lot coverage requirements of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance.
6. The general appearance of the residential addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the architectural design and materials will match the existing structure as closely as possible.
7. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
8. The construction of the addition to the existing residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.
9. The house as proposed will be similar in size to many others in the neighborhood that have single-car garages and the driveway apron is of adequate depth to accommodate an extra vehicle off the street.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, UP-00-31 and MM-00-07 shall not be valid for any purpose. UP-00-31 and MM-00-07 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The proposed addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 7, 2000, labeled Exhibit "A," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. Install new sanitary sewer clean-out at property line per City standard.
6. The residence, garage, and addition shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. Address numbers must be at least four inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
8. Sliding doors and windows that are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony) must have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.
9. Exterior entry doors (including pedestrian garage entry door) on the house are to be metal or 1-3/4" solid core wood with a deadbolt lock with a bolt throw of at least one inch. The front door must have a 190 degree peep viewer unless there are vision panels in or around the door.
10. Any windows in or adjacent to the front door and within reach (40") of the door locking device are to have burglary resistant glazing or be equivalently resistant.
11. If any French doors are installed, the inactive leaf must have floor and ceiling extension bolts of at least 3/4" throw.
12. The addition shall use exterior building materials which are compatible with the existing residence as indicated on the plans.
13. The designer shall ensure that the existing water service is sufficient for the new addition. Submit hydraulic calculation to the City of San Bruno Public Works Department for review if upsizing is necessary.

14. The homeowner shall ensure that the existing sewer service is adequate to handle the additional bathrooms as planned.
15. Storm water from the new addition roof downspout shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through a curb drain to the gutter.
16. The garage shall be used for the storage of vehicles. No part of the garage shall be used as living space.

(Chairperson Birt advised of the seven-day appeal period).

4. 1052 San Felipe Avenue (Tape file – 409A)

Request for a conditional use permit to construct a 912 square foot addition to the rear of an existing single family dwelling that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area and 1862 square feet of living area with a single-car garage where 1825 square feet is allowed; and would continue a substandard side yard setback; per Sections 12.120.010.B, 12.200.030.B.2 and 12.200.080.A.2 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - **Richard and Kristina McKenna**, owners; **Niall O'Neill**, designer/applicant; UP 00-32, MM-00-08.

Associate Planner Wilson entered staff report dated November 7, 2000, into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Applicant and owner present for any questions.

Public Comment Opened

Public Comment Closed

Motion Commissioner Tobin/ Second Schindler to approve UP-00-32 and MM-00-08 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-9) and Conditions of Approval (1-16).

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, October 28, 2000, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on October 27, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The use permit request to construct a 912 square foot addition to the single-family home at 1052 San Felipe Avenue will not be injurious or detrimental to the property and improvement in the

neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the addition complies with height and lot coverage requirements of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance.

6. The general appearance of the residential addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the architectural design and materials will match the existing structure as closely as possible.
7. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
8. The construction of the addition to the existing residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.
9. The house as proposed will be similar in size to many others in the neighborhood that have single-car garages and the driveway apron is of adequate depth to accommodate an extra vehicle off the street.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, UP-00-32 and MM-00-08 shall not be valid for any purpose. UP-00-32 and MM-00-08 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The proposed addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 7, 2000, labeled Exhibit "A," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. Install new sanitary sewer clean-out at property line per City standard.
6. The residence, garage, and addition shall be used only as a single family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. Address numbers must be at least four inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
8. Sliding doors and windows which are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony) must have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.

9. Exterior entry doors (including pedestrian garage entry door) on the house are to be metal or 1-3/4" solid core wood with a deadbolt lock with a bolt throw of at least one inch. The front door must have a 190 degree peep viewer unless there are vision panels in or around the door.
10. Any windows in or adjacent to the front door and within reach (40") of the door locking device are to have burglary resistant glazing or be equivalently resistant.
11. If any French doors are installed, the inactive leaf must have floor and ceiling extension bolts of at least 3/4" throw.
12. The addition shall use exterior building materials which are compatible with the existing residence as indicated on the plans.
13. The designer shall ensure that the existing water service is sufficient for the new addition. Submit hydraulic calculation to the City of San Bruno Public Works Department for review if upsizing is necessary.
14. The homeowner shall ensure that the existing sewer service is adequate to handle the additional bathrooms as planned.
15. Storm water from the new addition roof downspout shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through a curb drain to the gutter.
16. The garage shall be used for the storage of vehicles. No part of the garage shall be used as living space.

4. 3071 Susan Drive (Tape file – 409A)

Request for a Use Permit to construct a 1,763 square foot, second-story addition to an existing single family dwelling with a two car garage that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area, result in a floor area ratio of .552 which slightly exceeds the maximum allowed floor area ratio of .55 and contains greater than 2,800 sq.ft. of living area with a two car garage; per Sections 12.200.030.B.1 and 2, 12.200.050.B and 12.200.080.A.3 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - Butch Henke, applicant; **Mr. and Mrs. Henke**, owners; UP-00-34.

Associate Planner Padovan entered staff report dated November 7, 2000, into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Vice-Chair Johnson asked if there was an easement between the two homes. **Commissioner Tobin** stated that it was a **PG&E** easement.

Applicant and owner present for any questions.

Ms. Henke stated that there was an easement and that it has been used as a public right away.

Vice-Chair Johnson asked about the fence that is in the pathway that is ready to fall down.

Ms. Henke stated that the fence would be replaced.

Motion Commissioner Marshall / Second Schindler to approve Use Permit 00-34 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-7) and Conditions of Approval (1-12).

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, October 28, 2000 and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on October 27, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The request for a Use Permit to construct a 1,763 square foot, second-story addition to an existing single family dwelling with a two car garage that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area, result in a floor area ratio of .552 which slightly exceeds the maximum allowed floor area ratio of .55 and contains greater than 2,800 sq.ft. of living area with a two car garage at 3071 Susan Drive will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use because the addition will blend well with the existing home as well as those surrounding, there is adequate parking provided and the use is consistent with surrounding residential uses.
6. The new addition will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the proposal is consistent with the size and scale of the surrounding neighborhood and the design, architecture, and materials will match the existing structure.
7. The proposal for an expanded single-family home is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 00-34 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 00-

- 34 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The request for a Use Permit to construct a 1,763 square foot, second-story addition to an existing single family dwelling with a two car garage that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area, result in a floor area ratio of .552 which slightly exceeds the maximum allowed floor area ratio of .55 and contains greater than 2,800 sq.ft. of living area with a two car garage at 3071 Susan Drive shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 7, 2000 labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
 3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
 4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
 5. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. **No** portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
 6. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for revocation of this permit.
 7. Prior to final inspection, the windows, trim, and exterior finish and color on the addition and existing structure shall match.
 8. The entire structure shall be repainted and all previous window repairs shall be completed.
 9. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
 10. Install a new sanitary sewer clean out at the property line per City requirements.
 11. An encroachment permit shall be required for any work in the public right-of-way and no storage of building materials shall be permitted in the public right-of-way.
 12. Storm water from the roof of the new addition shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through a curb drain to the gutter.
- 6. 2540 Wentworth Drive (Tape File 409-A)**
Request for a Variance to allow a six (6) foot block wall to encroach three and a half (3.5) feet into the front yard setback where only a three (3) foot wall is permitted; per Chapter 12.124 and Section 12.84.150.A.2 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - Clodagh Coles, applicant/owner; V-00-05.

Associate Planner Padovan entered staff report dated November 7, 2000, into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Commissioner Marshall asked if the cement pad in front of the wall would be removed. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that staff was recommending for it to be removed and replaced with landscaping. **Commissioner Petersen** asked if staff would be open to other suggestions for the applicant for the front of the wall. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that they would be.

Applicant and owner was present for any questions.

She stated that she put up the fence for security reasons because she is in law enforcement. She said that she is willing to landscape, but wanted to leave the cement pad because it would be very costly to remove. **Commissioner Marshall** asked if the cement pad was there when she removed the wood fence. She confirmed that it was there previously. **Commissioner Schindler** wanted to know if the wall would have stucco on it. She confirmed that it would, but stopped the process when she found out about the violation.

Public Comment Opened

Public Comment Closed

Commissioner Petersen stated that he agrees with the applicant about tearing up the concrete pad, since it was there previous to the new wall. He suggested to put hedges, or a flower bed from one end to the other end of the wall. **Vice-Chair Johnson** stated that once the wall was covered with stucco it would be more attractive, and just add some greenery to the front. **Commissioner Tobin** recommended that a brick finish be applied to the outside, and a planter out of brick be built, to improve the appearance. **Commissioner Sammut** stated that there was a concrete pad and wood fence there to begin with, and when the wood fence was replaced with the block wall, a complaint comes in, and wonders if she would have replaced the wooden fence with another wooden fence, if no complaint would have been called in. But does not agree with asking her to tear up the cement pad, based on the fact that there are so many other homes in the area that are in violation of the code. **Chair Birt** asked if taking #7 out of the conditions would be appropriate. **Commissioner Marshall** stated that a condition be included that owner satisfy staff with any landscaping. Staff and owner can come to an agreement, instead of the commission having to come up with exactly what she should do.

Motion Commissioner Marshall / Second Petersen to approve Variance 00-05 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-9) and Conditions of Approval (1-7).

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, October 28, 2000, and 29 notices mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on October 27, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.

3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The general appearance of the block wall is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the finished details and landscape screen will improve the visual character of the neighborhood.
6. The proposed block wall will not pose a visual obstruction to a motorist on the street or in the driveway and will not pose a danger to pedestrians on the sidewalk. Also, the wall will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
7. The construction of the block wall is consistent with the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance which allows for walls in the front yard setback.
8. Due to the existing development of the subject property and well as those surrounding, the strict application of this article will deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under identical single-family residential zone classification.
9. The granting of this Variance, as conditioned, does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and in the single-family residential zone district in which the subject property is located. A significant number of lots in the surrounding area have some form of nonconforming walls and landscape hedges and the ability to develop their property within the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance is similarly constrained and would justify the granting of a Variance.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Variance 00-05 shall not be valid for any purpose. Variance 00-05 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The request for a Variance to allow a six (6) foot block wall to encroach three and a half (3.5) feet into the front yard setback where only a three (3) foot wall is permitted shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 7, 2000, labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.

3. All pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
 4. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
 5. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for revocation of this permit.
 6. A stucco finish shall be applied to the block wall and it shall be painted to match the dwelling.
 7. The concrete area directly in front of the wall may remain but landscaping shall be added. A landscape plan shall be required within 30 days of the granting of this Variance and the landscaping shall be installed within 60 days. Failure to conform with these conditions will result in further action by the city which could result in the potential removal of the wall.
- 10. Capital Improvement Project Budget (Tape File 409-A)**
Planning Commission review of Capital Improvement Project Budget for conformance with the General Plan.

Associate Planner Wilson reviewed the Capital Improvement Project Budget that is presented annually. Work on the proposed Police Station at Tanforan is in the budget this time.

Community Development Director Foscardo clarified that this budget comes before the Planning Commission every year to make sure that roads are not put into places where roads are not called for. But all the items comply with the General Plan.

Commissioner Petersen move to motion on this item via roll call vote. Motion passed by roll call vote, all commissioners in favor.

11. City Staff Discussion

Community Development Director Foscardo introduced new **Assistant Planner Sage**. Also announced the date of the Planning Commission appreciation party. **Commissioner Sammut** asked about the lot behind the **Jiffy Lube** on Santa Maria, and if it would be getting cleaned up.

Community Development Director Foscardo stated that he is having trouble with the lot, and the people in the house next door. Staff will be following up with that issue. The neighborhood improvement representatives who have been out the past few months will be sending out an announcement that conveys any business that is not in compliance with city ordinances will be receiving a letter after the first of the year.

12. Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Tobin requested to have any pre-read information that is available earlier than the 3 day notice, to be notified, so he can have addition time to review information.

Motion Johnson to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

George Foscardo

Secretary to the Planning Commission
City of San Bruno

Terry Birt, Chairperson

Planning Commission
City of San Bruno

NEXT MEETING: December 5, 2000

GF/ts